

**MINUTES OF THE PLAN NANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2007-DEC-11 AT 5:00 PM, IN THE
BOARD ROOM, CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET**

Present:

Councillor Bill Holdom	Jane Gregory
Gail Adrienne	David Hill-Turner
Brian Anderson	Shirley Lance
Carey Avender	Ralph Meyerhoff
Chris Erb	Gord Turgeon
Bill Forbes	David Hill-Turner
Michael Geselbracht	

Staff:

Ted Swabey, General Manager, Development Services
Andrew Tucker, Director, Planning & Development
Bruce Anderson, Manager, Community Planning
Deborah Jensen, Community Development Planner
Fran Grant (Recording Secretary)

Regrets:

Jolyon Brown	Nadine Schwager
Michael Schellinck	Darwin Mahlum

Members of the public: 18

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chair B. Holdom at 5:05 p.m.

2. Adoption of Minutes for 2007-NOV-20:

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by C. Erb , that the minutes of 2007-NOV-20 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items:

MOVED by B. Forbes, SECONDED by R. Meyerhoff, that the Agenda be accepted as presented.

CARRIED

4. Correspondence:

Letter from Joe Burnett, Electoral Area A, regarding Cable Bay lands.

5. **Presentations:**

- a) OCP37 – Cable Bay Lands (Cable Bay Lands Inc.)
950 / 960 / 1170 / 1260 / 1270 Phoenix Way

Chair B. Holdom noted that, at an earlier PNAC meeting and public meeting, the Committee had turned the proposal down. The Committee needs to make another recommendation to Council on the revised project proposal.

Glenn Brower gave a presentation on the Cable Bay lands proposal.

Following the presentation, G. Brower gave the following answers to questions from Committee members:

- Madrone Environmental biologists Tania Tripp and Helen Reid worked on the environmental assessment for the project.
- Madrone Environmental endorsed the project design. A copy can be provided to interested PNAC members. A letter of endorsement is attached to the environmental report, as provided to the City.
- Vertical growth means building up instead of out, with more four storey apartment buildings and townhouse units rather than single family homes.
- In order to eliminate sprawl, we want to densify land use and these lands are still within the City of Nanaimo.
- No other site in the City could accommodate a golf course. Only reason this project can succeed is with the golf course.
- Much of the development, including the 'resort centre', is designed around the site's topography; particularly because of the location of the golf course, this was the only way to do it.
- Would not have economic benefits to the City without golf course. It is the feature that makes the project attractive to the City and residents.
- If refused by Council, zoning allows for 66 - five acre parcels with two homes possible on each.
- ESAs are not easily preserved if they are on private property. If a subdivision is applied for, then the ESAs could be protected. For example, with five acre parcels, could put covenants on lots indicating ESAs as no-build areas.
- Some projections have been made that about 30% – 37% of the residents would be transitional. Seniors housing would be 300-400 units. Some retirees would also be considered transitional, only living there part of the year.
- Some of the people who work in the development might be able to afford the apartments. Also talking to RDN transit about extending routes so workers don't need to drive to access the site.
- Project will generate approximately 500 jobs.

In response to a question from PNAC, A. Tucker noted:

- The City does not have a resort designation in the OCP. If Council approves the application, staff would be directed to develop a new resort designation and its associated policies.
- Resort development can also have quarter-share ownership on some units and this could be part of OCP amendment.

PNAC commented:

- We have a UCB, and a large majority of residents want to see the UCB maintained; PNAC has rejected other applications to move the UCB.
- There are some valid points to the project; it may work in the future but not at this time.
- UCB should be City limits because we are piece-meal moving the UCB all the time.
- One thing in favour of this proposal is that the alternative of five acre parcels is the worst land use we could have and the worst for urban sprawl. We need to densify.
- The entire project is urban sprawl because it is so far from the City centre.
- If employees could not afford to live on site, it would mean a lot of commuting for people working there.
- Concerns brought forward by Cedar residents have been addressed.
- UCB has recently been changed for the South Nanaimo Lands.
- Need the UCB maintained. If this application is approved, we might as well forget the UCB. Need to densify within the UCB; by definition, we are promoting more sprawl if this application is approved.
- Because this is the only place to build a golf course is not a good enough reason to approve the project; have enough golf courses already.
- Community has asked that we maintain the UCB.
- PNAC's position has been to maintain the UCB.

Chair B. Holdom noted:

- Correspondence distributed to the Committee, as received from the Director of Electoral Area A, states that 97.3 acres is in Area A, outside the City boundary; this should be dealt with first before considering the application.
- If the City of Nanaimo rejects the application, the question is moot.
- If approved, the approval would have to be subject to the Regional District of Nanaimo's Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) acceptance and by the Province approving the annexing of the 97.3 acres.

PNAC commented:

- Discussing five acre lots is not beneficial; due to zoning, those lots have always been an option, as with most other properties outside the UCB.
- With respect to ESAs, there is a comparable property on Harewood Plains which was zoned for development; the ESA inventory has effectively stopped development as the property will be limited by the existence of the ESAs. Property owner will have to develop around them. Designation of ESAs has some role to play in development process. Would potentially restrict the number of five acre lots and number of homes.

T. Swabey advised that

- Still don't know what the Harewood Plains property owner will do as the City has designated all of the property an ESA, which is very different from this application.
- Don't know what will occur on the property until a development proposal comes in.
- If development proceeds as five acre lots with two homes, those homes would need approval from the Health Authority that the property could handle two septic fields.
- Developing as five acre lots could possibly inhibit the City's ability to get infrastructure funding in the future.
- If all homes are on wells, water quality could also be an issue.
- RGS has a resort designation. The proposed development at Boat Harbour would fall under this designation.
- The Cable Bay lands were originally part of Harmac's lands.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by G. Adrienne, that PNAC recommend Council reject this application.

DEFEATED (6 in favour, 6 opposed)

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by Brian Anderson, that PNAC recommend Council accept this application.

CARRIED (7 in favour, 5 opposed)

PNAC commented:

- Should make a statement to Council with a motion showing there is a split on the Committee.

Chair B. Holdom noted that staff will be directed to draft a bylaw which would then go to Council for 1st and 2nd Reading before going to Public Hearing.

6. Next Meeting:

The next meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2007-DEC-18, December dinner venue at Zougla Restaurant, 2021 Estevan.

7. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.